

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 12, 14, 16-18 and 20 are amended and claim 10 is cancelled. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Kim and Supervisory Examiner Hewitt in the October 16, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 10 has been cancelled, rendering its rejection moot. The rejection with respect to claims 1-9 and 11 is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleged that claim 1 recited methods broad enough to read on a person performing the steps of claim 1. As agreed during the personal interview, claim 1 has been amended to call for a device implemented method. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, "possible" has been deleted from claims 1, 12 and 20 as agreed during the personal interview.

Claims 8 and 14 were rejected for improper antecedent basis of "the retail store." By this Amendment, claims 8 and 14 have been amended to provide correct antecedent basis in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions.

Claims 2 and 15 were rejected for "a payment media handling apparatus electronic coupling event" allegedly being indefinite, because one of ordinary skill in the art would allegedly not be able to reasonably ascertain the scope of the invention. During the personal interview, the Examiner alleged that coupling only refers to the act of making a mechanical

connection, such as with pipes or hoses. Applicants respectfully submit that this is improperly importing limitations into the claim. Further, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to reasonably ascertain the scope of the invention by reading at least paragraphs [0193] and [0194].

Claim 20 was rejected because it is allegedly unclear whether the claim calls for an apparatus or functions of the apparatus. As agreed during the personal interview, claim 20 has been amended to clearly call for an apparatus. For the reasons discussed below, the applied art fails to disclose a controller that is structured as defined by claim 20.

Claims 4-7 were rejected because claim 2 calls for payment media handling operation events in the alternative but claims 4-7 call for specific payment media handling operation events resulting in an alleged logical inconsistency. By this Amendment, claims 4-6 have been amended to call for a specific payment media handling operation event and to depend from independent claim 1, eliminating any alleged logical inconsistencies.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Drummond et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0096994. Claim 10 has been cancelled, rendering its rejection moot. The rejection with respect to claims 1-9 and 11-20 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for prompting the responsible party, prior to the providing step, whether it wants to receive the set of instructions. Claims 12 and 20 call for similar features. The Office Action, with respect to the rejection of cancelled claim 10, alleges that Drummond discloses these features at paragraphs [0097], [0116], [0145] and [0153]. Applicants respectfully disagree.

None of the paragraphs cited in Drummond prompt the responsible party whether it wants to receive the set of instructions. Paragraph [0097] discusses prompting the user to


select a transaction. Paragraph [0116] discusses whether the user wants to conduct another transaction. Paragraph [0145] specifically discusses a lack of instructions. Paragraph [0153] discusses the delivery of records through a mini-HTTP server. None of the cited paragraphs, nor any other portions of Drummond, discuss providing the user with a choice of receiving or not receiving instructions. Effectively, Drummond forces the user to receive instructions. The user cannot proceed without getting instructions. That is, Drummond does not teach or suggest prompting the responsible party whether it wants to receive a set of instructions.

Claims 2-9, 11 and 13-19 depend from, and are patentable with, one of independent claims 1 and 12, as well as the additional features they recite. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks
Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/mcp

Date: October 21, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--